

conjunction with that move in a number of states now have passed resolutions asking the United States Congress to take a little closer look at the Safe Drinking Water Act, and specifically at those provisions of the amended Safe Drinking Water Act that require extensive testing of water in all of the small and large systems that are used around the state for purposes of the drinking water of our population. And this particular resolution is a recommendation to participate in that particular petitioning of the Congress, and that's what this is all about. And I'll talk about that a little bit more in a minute. But the first thing I wanted to talk about was the committee's recommendation in terms of a committee amendment, which was simply to strike one of the whereas clauses. The whereas clause that was stricken made reference to a specific congressional alternative that was before the House of Representatives. The committee felt that we were on safer ground, given our level of knowledge, to simply strike that particular provision, and thereby make the petition broad in scope, simply saying that the Safe Drinking Water Act be amended in such a manner as will permit public water supply systems to focus their resources on issues that threaten public health and which will provide flexibility in meeting the real health needs of the citizenry. In other words, asking Congress to take another close look at all of the different proposals before it, without identifying one with that intent and purpose and focus in mind. Would recommend the adoption of the committee amendments.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. I rise in support of the amendment. I was one of the people who had some concerns with the particular language and a particular House resolution before Congress, and the ramifications of that. I think we need to be concerned about the costs of the tests that we're going to have to perform on water, but I think we also need to do it with some realism. Obviously, we don't need to test for some problems with pineapple, here in Nebraska, since I haven't seen too many pineapple fields. But I think we do need to be cautious, we do have problems with our water, the nitrate levels and other contaminants. But I think if we establish a baseline of what contaminants are here, and then are only required to have to test for those contaminants, but to test realistically and in a cost-effective manner, then everyone wins, including the environment and all of us who have to depend on that for our livelihood in the future. So I support this